

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to facsimile number 703-872-9306.

Date of Transmission:

Typed Name of Person Mailing Paper or Doc: Natalie King

Signature:



PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO. 10014091-1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AUG 24 2004

OFFICIAL

INVENTOR(S): Huitao Luo

SERIAL NO.: 10/046,797

GROUP ART UNIT: 2676

FILED: January 14, 2002

EXAMINER: A. Richer

SUBJECT: Systems and Methods for Processing Boundary Information of a Graphical Object

Interview Summary A

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephone conference of July 8, 2004. The undersigned and the Examiner discussed the Office Action dated May 25, 2004. More specifically, the undersigned noted that claims 33-34 were not examined or allowed and Applicant requested clarification of the status of such claims in a subsequent Office Action so Applicant could determine how to appropriately proceed with the prosecution of this application. Applicant also presented arguments regarding patentability of the rejected claims. For example, Applicant traversed the obviousness rejection of claims 1 and 12 based upon the fact that Kim is directed towards encoding of data for compression for later reconstruction of the data and the purpose of Kim would be destroyed if the subject matter of Kim were modified pursuant to the Office Action to permit user specification of points as alleged to

PDNO. 10014091-1
Serial No. 10/046,797
Amendment A

be disclosed by Ikezawa. In particular, the combination would require significant modification of Kim, require significant user intervention during operation, and at a minimum would drastically slow the encoding process of Kim to unacceptable speeds which defeat the efficiencies gained by encoding in the first instance. Further at least in view of the numerous drawbacks of the modification of Kim set forth in the Office Action, there is no motivation to modify the reference teachings in support of the rejection and the only motivation results from improper reliance upon Applicant's disclosure. It was agreed that Applicant would decide how to proceed after receiving the follow-up new Office Action.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,
Huitao Luo

By: 

James D. Shaurette
Reg. No. 39,833
Date: 8/24/04
(509) 624-4276

PDNO. 10014091-1
Serial No. 10/046,797
Amendment A